

*The Deity and Satisfaction of CHRIST
asserted.*

BEING AN
ANSWER

To the Second Part of an
Anonymous Pamphlet,

INTITLED,
Causa Dei contra Novatores;

OR,
GOD ever propitious to his People.

In a LETTER to the AUTHOR.

By SAMUEL WILSON.

*Feed the Church of God which he hath purchased with
his own Blood. Acts xx. 28..*

L O N D O N :

Printed for AARON WARD, at the *King's-Arms* in Little-
Britain; JOHN OSWALD in the *Poultry*; JAMES
BUCKLAND in *Pater-noster-Row*; and H. WHIT-
RIDGE at the *Royal-Exchange*. 1747.

[Price Six-pence.]

The Deacons of the Church of Christ

BEING AN

ANSWER

To the Second Part of an

Anonymous Pamphlet

ENTITLED

On the Duty of the Church



and the Duty of the Deacons

In a Letter to the Author

of the Pamphlet

entitled

On the Duty

of the Church and the Duty of the Deacons

I
o
ne
"
"
"
"
"
tio
in
Ye
her

A
L E T T E R
T O T H E

Author of an Anonymous Pamphlet,

I N T I T L E D,

Causa Dei contra Novatores, &c.

S I R,

IF your Title has any *Meaning*, I am one of the *Novatores*, engaged against the Cause of God, which you undertake to vindicate: A Term of *Reproach* in your Outset, not quite consistent with the Smoothness of your first Paragraph, in which you say, " You treat me with a due Regard to my Character, as a Person, who, you hope, proposes to employ his utmost Skill and Endeavours to defend and promote the true Christian Religion." If you had not mentioned *Causa Dei*, it might look like Pleasantry in turning the Tables upon us.

YOUR Brethren, you know, have for many Years charged us with a base, servile Adherence to *musty* Creeds, and *obsolete* Confessions,

fions, the Productions of Ages, infamous for Ignorance and Superstition; but with you, it seems, we are new *Schemers*, starting Principles the World was never before acquainted with, or at least till very lately: You may enjoy the Pleasure of the new invented Term, but give me Leave to say, our Principles are as *old* as Revelation, nor do we expect a *new Gospel* from the utmost Improvements in Philosophy, or Criticism.

I SUPPOSE you think there is an utter Inconsistency, between *Christ the great Propitiation*, and *God ever propitious to his People*, or we should not have found them in Contrast in your Title; but how God is, or can be propitious without any Regard to a Propitiation, is, I confess, beyond me to account for.

WHEN I take a serious View of the Divine Perfections, and attend to the Nature and End of God's moral Government, and duly consider the Tenor of Revelation; Nothing is more evident, than that God is Merciful, and in the Exercise of this Mercy, is in ^a *Christ reconciling the World unto himself, not imputing their Trespases, having made Christ to be Sin for us, who knew no Sin, that we might become the Righteousness of God in him.*

I STAY not to remark on your *Scraps of Greek*, which, from their Repetition, you seem to be very fond of, any farther than to observe, that excepting the Embellishment of

^a 2 Cor. v. 19, 21.

the Frontispiece, and proclaiming the Learning of the Author, they are quite unnecessary.

WE are in no Pain about entertaining too exalted Apprehensions of the Son, or of representing his Glory to the *Dis honour* or *Displeasure* of the Father, when we have his express Command, ^b *That all Men should honour the Son, even as they honour himself.*

As to the *Occasion* of my Sermon and Remarks, the *Matter* contained in them I should think is rather the Subject of your Enquiry, than what might lead me to publish them.

You say you are “ concerned when unnecessary Controversies are started, and think “ a private Conference had been preferable, “ &c.”

WHAT you mean by *unnecessary Controversies*, I know not : Surely, Sir, you will not place Enquiries into the *Object* of Worship, and the Foundation of our Hope in that Number ? If these are trifling and unnecessary, What are serious and important ?

AND if you think so well of a *private Conference*, How is it, Sir, that I never had the Favour of a Visit, knew nothing of your Design till the World was possessed of it, and your Pamphlet put into my Hands by a Friend, without your Knowledge or Direction ?

AFTER this somewhat *inconsistent* Introduction, you come to my Sermon, and quoting a Passage from Page 1, in which a Case is

^b John v. 23.

supposed, and my Opinion given : That if a Christian or Minister should attend a dying Criminal, and be silent as to Christ the great Redeemer, he would contradict his Character, affront the Saviour, and injure the Penitent.

THIS you say “ is a severe but not very just “ Reflection.”

IT may appear in this Light to you, but with us a *Christian*, and an *Heathen*, a *Gospel Minister*, and *Moral Philosopher*, are by no Means convertible Terms; and we are much persuaded, that *Pardon* through the *Blood* or for the *Sake* of Christ, is essential to Salvation, and therefore of absolute Necessity to be laid before a dying Criminal. In the Neglect of this you say, “ ‘ Mr Foster, as became a “ worthy judicious Divine, gave the dying “ Lord K——ck all the necessary Christian “ Assistance, &c. and that a Prophet or an “ Apostle would have used the same Method.” Yea, according to you, he followed the *Rule of Christ himself*, that “ Rule, by which a “ spiritual Assistant ought to form the Mind “ of every Sinner.”

THIS, I confess, is putting the Gentleman into the best Company, and straining the Compliment to the utmost : But there are certain Consequences attending it, you will do well to consider.

ACCORDING to this, a *penitent Frame* of Mind, with what you call *Conversion* to God,

are the *only* Things a dying Sinner should be concerned for : Possessed of these, he wants no *Atonement* for *past Transgressions*, and is as safe to all Intents and Purposes as if Christ had never come into the World, or given his Life a Ransom for him.

WE readily grant the Necessity of Repentance, Regeneration, and Sanctification, but are these our Plea for Pardon, or our justifying Righteousness in the Sight of God ?

THE Prophets every where call to Repentance, the Apostles did so, and our Lord says to his Followers, ^d *except you repent, ye shall all likewise perish*. But is this the whole Account we have of Salvation ? If so, you have brought the Gospel indeed into a narrow Compass ; and had the inspired Penmen been of your Judgment, a great deal of unnecessary Pains might have been spared in treating on the Doctrine of Pardon and Justification.

As to the Parable of the prodigal Son, which you seem to lay so much Stress on ; I suppose you will grant, that we are not to look for a *System* of Doctrine in an *allegorical* Representation.

IF you examine the Context, you will find the Occasion of this, and the two preceding Parables, was an unjustifiable Exception of the Scribes and Pharisees to our Lord's familiar Converse with Publicans and Sinners : To convince them of their Mistake, and vindicate

^d Luke xiii. 3, 5.

his own Conduct, Christ holds forth the Mercy of God to the *chief* of Sinners; that it was not confined, as they imagined, to the more civilized or moral, but where the Grace of God is found in the Heart, and the Fruits of it appear in the Life, nothing that is past shall be a Bar to Acceptance, and that all Sinners stand on a Level in their Return to God, with whom there is Forgiveness, and plenteous Redemption.

THIS, Sir, was the single Point our Lord had in View, and not the meritorious Cause of Pardon, which is most clearly and abundantly represented in other Places of Scripture, and which at this Time to have insisted on, would have led him beside his Subject, and unnecessarily exposed himself to the Cavil of his Enemies.

As to what you say of the *Mercy* and *Goodness* of God, you might have transcribed all the Passages in the Bible relating to that glorious Attribute, but what are they to the Argument?

WE allow we are saved *through Grace*, that a merciful God is the Author of Salvation; but the Question is, does this Grace *reign* through the *Righteousness* of *Christ*, or *our own*? We admit Pardon is promised to the Penitent, but is it for his own Sake, or on the Behalf of Christ? Is he *washed from his Sins* in his own Tears, or in the *Blood* of the great Mediator?

I AM

I AM tempted to say, all that you have advanced on this Head, is a mere Parade of Words, visibly foreign, and inconclusive. Of the same Kind is the Whole of your next Page: You know we are far from denying the Character of *Redeemer* to the Father, we believe he is the glorious Contriver of the Method of Salvation, but what we contend for is, that in his *Son alone we have Redemption through his Blood the Forgiveness of Sin*; nor can we believe the Father was ever incarnate, or shed his Blood with that View.

You insinuate, that we *Moderns* represent Christ as the only Redeemer, and overlook the God of Christ.

As to the *obtaining* Salvation, we think the Scripture, for the most Part, attributes it to the second Person in the Trinity, and that for the 'fore-mentioned Reason, it being only true of him that he laid down his Life, or gave it as a *Ransom for many*. And whenever Mention is made of the Father in this Character, relating to Salvation, it must be understood of him, as acting by his Son. Thus, in the Text you refer to, *Zacharias* begins his solemn Thanksgiving, *“Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed his People. How? by an Act of mere Mercy or Power? No, he adds, who hath raised up an Horn of Salvation for us, in the House of his Servant David, that is, sent his Son into the*

^c Luke i. 68, 69.

World, to *save us from Wrath*, and *that we might live through him*.

I MIGHT here put you in Mind, that not one of the Ancients, or any of our reformed Divines, ever disputed the Character of a *Redeemer* as belonging to Christ, and I think you are one of the first, and I hope will be the last who shall be suffered to oppose it.

IF you think *Moses* better deserves the Character of a *Redeemer* than *Christ*, you are to be pitied; but your critical Observation, that the Word *Redeemer* is but once used in the *New Testament*, and then applied to *Moses*, will have little Weight with those who constantly read of Christ's *redeeming us*, of his *having obtained Redemption for us*, and *that we have Redemption through his Blood*, &c.

AND I believe you will be hard put to it, with all your Learning, to show how a Person can be said to *redeem*, who is not a *Redeemer*.

JACOB, if he did not associate a created Angel with God, in his solemn Prayer for *Joseph's Children*, speaks of Christ in his Divine and Mediatorial Capacities, saying, ^f *God, before whom my Fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my Life long unto this Day, the Angel which redeemed me from all Evil, bless the Lads*, &c. And *Job* is yet more express, ^g *I know that my Redeemer liveth, and he shall stand at the latter Day on the Earth; and though after my Skin,*

^f Gen. xlviii. 15, 16.

^g Job xix. 25, 26.

of CHRIST asserted. II

Worms destroy this Body, yet in my Flesh I shall see God; that is, God my Redeemer, who will be incarnate, and stand on the Earth, which I suppose you will hardly understand of the Father.

YOUR Account of Christ as God's Minister, and Instrument only, in our Redemption, is without Proof, and evidently contrary to Scripture; and had you taken the Whole of *St Peter's* Testimony, it would have set you right in this Matter: True, he says, that *God exalted him to be a Prince, and a Saviour to give Repentance and Remission of Sins.* Characters which, by the Way, are far from being *only Ministerial*; and from the same Mouth we are informed, that Christ ^h *his own self bare our Sins in his own Body on the Tree, and that by his Stripes we are healed, that* ⁱ *he suffered the Just for the Unjust; k* yea, that *there is Salvation in no other, nor any other Name given under Heaven among Men whereby we can be saved; that* ^l *in his Name whosoever believeth, shall receive Remission of Sin.*

You reduce all this to Christ's publishing Salvation, and that merely on the Foot of Repentance; surely, you can hardly persuade yourself to believe, that the Apostle would have used all this Language only to set forth, that Man is to be saved by his own Repentance, and Christ sent of his Father to proclaim it.

^h 1 Peter ii. 24.
^l Acts x. 43.

ⁱ 1 Peter iii. 18.

^k Acts iv. 12.

IN Page 31 you suppose, and are right in it, that notwithstanding any thing you have yet advanced, I shall urge, "that the Blood of Christ ought to have been mentioned to my Lord K——ck."

You reply, had he been a *Martyr*, &c. it would have been proper. But unhappy for him, poor Earl! he was an *Offender against the Laws of God and Man*, and so had nothing to do with the Death of Christ: "A Sense of his Crimes, and a sincere Conversion of Heart from all Sin unto the holy Commandment, and unto God," was all he was to be brought to.

NOT to attend to the awkward Manner of Expression, "a Conversion to the holy Commandment, and unto God," pray, Sir, have none but Martyrs a Concern with the Death of Christ? What think you of that plain Scripture, ^m *It's a faithful Saying, and worthy of all Acceptation, that Christ came into the World to save Sinners*; or of our Lord's own Account of his Mission, that ⁿ *he came to save such as were lost*, ^o *not to call the Righteous, but Sinners to Repentance*.

IT'S very evident from the Account we have from Mr *Foster* himself, that my Lord K——ck had some Thoughts of the bitter Cup put into our Lord's Hand, and though he was modestly afraid to apply it to his own Case, I do not find his spiritual Assistant angry

^m 1 Tim. i. 15.

ⁿ Matth. xviii. 11.

^o Matth. xix. 13

with him for it, or limiting the Death of Christ to Martyrs, though, it seems, he did not think it proper to recommend him, to a fiducial Dependence on the Merits of it, for Pardon and Acceptance.

You then return to what you had before asserted, that God, I suppose you mean the Father, is often represented as a "Saviour and Redeemer."

THIS is granted, and what then? Is not Christ our Redeemer too? This should be proved, or you gain nothing by the Repetition.

YOUR Interpretation of 1 Cor. i. 30, 31, is forced and unnatural; and entirely foreign to your Purpose; we allow that Christ is made of God unto us, Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification, and Redemption, and that this is by a Divine Constitution; but does this prove he is not a Redeemer? Or that Martyrs only are concerned in his Death? Receiving Characters from the Father as Mediator, is no Ways inconsistent with his essential Glory as God over all, blessed for ever.

You charge us, Page 32, "with not being content with the Honour given to Christ by his Father," and say, "we raise him much higher in his Essence and Nature."

To be plain, Sir, we think this impossible. Whatever you may judge of Christ, we believe him to be truly and properly God, and that he is *Συυθρονος*, is evident from the Worship of Heaven directed to the *P Lamb in the*

Midst of the Throne, which Character you will hardly apply to the Father.

THAT he is *Συνθεός*, the Evangelist declares in so many Words, ^a *he was with God*, and what he adds, that *he was God*, even the *God* who created all Things, abundantly warrants the Title of *Αυτοθεός*, unless we can conceive of a *God* without *Self-existence*.

WITH us the two former are expressive of his distinct Personality from, and Equality in Glory with the Father; the latter, of the Sameness of Nature, or Essence.

You add, some “carry their Devotion higher, and represent God the Father *rigid* and unforgiving, but Christ as atoning satisfying, &c.” And is there no Difference between *rigid* and *righteous*? Must the Son be more *placable* in *making* Satisfaction than the Father who *gave* him out of his Bosom for this very *End* and *Purpose*? I beseech you reason more closely, or cease your Exclamations?

I HEARTILY wish you knew more of the Doctrine of the blessed Jesus, and you would express more Reverence for his Person, and Regard to his Glory!

You have Expectations from my “Candour and Integrity as to a careful Review of my “Notion of a Redeemer.” Had you offered any thing material from the Word of God to set me right, no one would sooner own the

^a John i. 1.

Obligation; but in the Want of this I must be excused in abiding by the Scripture Account, that *Christ hath redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, and is the End of the Law for Righteousness to every one who believes.*

As to the Inconsistency between Christ the Great Redeemer, and Christ the Great Propitiation, it is only in your own Imagination. Our Lord assures us, he came *to give his Life a Ransom for many*; the Apostle tells us, *he by himself purged away our Sins by the Sacrifice of himself*, and Glory is given to him by the Church triumphant, *for redeeming his People unto God by his own Blood.* What can be more plain? Is he not a Redeemer? And how does he redeem, but by the *Sacrifice of himself*; or, in other Words, by himself the Great, and, I add, *only Propitiation?*

PAGE 33, you find Fault with my Definition of Propitiation, but substitute nothing in the Room of it, and gravely ask, What was that *something* offered to God according to Moses's Law?

HAD you asked what was that *something* which the Gospel reveals, the Answer is, *Christ himself, the great propitiatory Sacrifice*: The Substance of all the ceremonial Oblations.

You agree the Offerings "of Goats, Calves, " and Birds, sanctified only to the purifying " of the Flesh," yet add, "God was pacified,

^r Gal. iii. 13.

^f Rom. x. 4.

^t Matth. xx. 28.

^u Heb. i. 3. Chap. ix. 26. compared.

^x Rev. v. 9.

and the Sinner forgiven ;” whereas the Apostle is exprefs, *ⁱ they were but a Shadow of good Things to come, did not make the Worshippers perfect*, and that it was not possible, that the *Blood of Bulls and Goats should take away Sin*, which he introduces as a remarkable Illustration of the Grace of Christ, in saying, *Lo, I come to do thy Will, O God*: So that your reasoning about God’s being *placable* from this Consideration, is wide of your Purpose, and in the Face of Inspiration.

ON cool Reflection, you will find the Argument turns against you: What can we conclude from the continued *Torrent* of Blood in the Tabernacle and Temple-Services, but that God is not a *rigid*, but *righteous* Being, not *implacable*, but of *² purer Eyes than to behold Iniquity*, without declaring his utter Detestation of it.

You add, “ God may appoint what Propitiations or Satisfactions he pleases.”

IF I am Judge of your Sentiments, whatever he *may*, it would be inglorious to his Mercy to appoint *any*, why else are you so angry with the Doctrine of Propitiation? Or is it more agreeable to allow this to a *Jew* offering up his *Beast*, than to a Christian pleading the *Atonement* of the Messiah? The Truth is, both were the Institution of God, and the one relative to the other; the Figure had it’s

ⁱ Heb. x. 1, 2, 4, 7.

² Hab. i. 13.

Use in the *Nonage* of the Church, the Substance is our *Mercy* and *Glory*.

YOUR next two Pages and an half are filled with Encomiums on the Mercy of God, as to which you have no Opposer, if you allow this Mercy to descend to us through a Mediator.

PAGE 36, you seem to go off from your Subject, and assert Christ to have "laid down," "as a fundamental Principle, that there is "none good," you add Person, "but one Person, that is, God," by whom you mean the Father; so the Version, you say, should be. According to this, Christ is not *God*, and the Scripture-Representation of his Deity not to depended on: But pray, Sir, reconsider; the Design of our Lord was not to represent an *Unity* of *Personality*, but of *Deity*, which is every where asserted in Revelation, and to which we heartily agree.

Who ever doubted that *every good and perfect Gift comes down from the Father of Lights?* Or, that *Christ is the Gift of God?* But your Inference from it is most *extraordinary*, that therefore God is not "unpropitious, but loving "and benevolent to Mankind," *Sinners* you should have said, and then have proved that he is so, without a Propitiation or any Regard to his Son the great Saviour.

I HAVE no Doubt of the Father's raising Christ from the Dead, and giving him Glory as Mediator, and well know, that God is the Object of *Faith* and *Hope*; that we are to
C love,

love, serve, and praise him, and believe all this to be very practicable under the Influence of the Divine Spirit, with maintaining the Glory of his *Holiness* and *Justice*, in requiring a Satisfaction which his own *Mercy* and *Kindness* provided for us.

YOU insinuate, without Reason, that I am for excluding the Mercy of God. I am not conscious of the least Hint to that Purpose in any Part of my Sermon or Remarks; and, whatever you may think, that God is reconciled to us, and at Peace with us, for the Sake of Christ, is the Doctrine of the Bible, and expressly declared in the Text you produce in Opposition to what I had asserted; for the Non-imputation of Sin manifestly discovers, that the Matter of Quarrel is taken away by Jesus, who is *our Peace*, and *reconciled us to God by his Death*.

YOUR Repetition of Christ's being the free Gift of God, &c. makes nothing for your Purpose, unless you can prove he was given only as an *Example*, or *Teacher*, and not as a *Ransom*, and *Sacrifice*.

If you will not distinguish *Love* in God as the *principle*, and the *Atonement* of Christ as the *meritorious Reason* of *Forgiveness*, the Scripture is full of it, and no where more than in the Passages you refer to, "God so loved the World, that he gave his Son, &c." To do what? To *reveal* his *Grace*, and tell us God is merciful. Was this the *only Thing* in the Divine View? Was it not to *lay down his Life*,
and

and obtain Salvation for us? And when the Apostle says, "In this was manifested the Love of God towards us, because God sent his only begotten Son into the World, that we might live by him." Surely he intends more than our being *taught* by him, or there is no Meaning in Words.

You say Christ was "a Propitiation sent from God, not offered to him." Then he was a Propitiation before his Incarnation; and yet you immediately add, "God sent Christ to declare his Propitiation, or a Tender of his Love and Favour to Mankind."

WHAT is all this, but an unmeaning Sound of Words? Is Christ a *Propitiation*, or is he not? You suggest, Page 41, "that the God of all Grace wants no Sin-offering to make him gracious, or Propitiation to render him propitious." Why then do you say, "Christ was a Propitiation, and as such appointed and pre-ordained of God according to his good Pleasure." If this is not Self-contradiction, I know not what is.

WHAT you add concerning the *Jewish* Sacrifices, has been answered already, and I cannot help observing the unfair Manner of your introducing *Moses*, the Prophets, Christ and his Apostles, recommending Repentance and Reformation, Who ever doubted this? But does it hence follow, that Repentance and Amendment are the Foundation of our Pardon?

A CONNECTION we allow, he that gives Grace, will give Glory, and none but the pure

in Heart shall see God : But surely it is Christ
^a *who delivers from the Wrath to come, and*
^a *bath made Peace by the Blood of his Cross.*

I AM still of the same Mind, that the high Encomiums of the Love of the Father in sending Christ, and Grace of the Son in dying for us, might, upon your Principles, have been spared. Why might not another *Moses* or *Elijah* have published the *Mercy* and *Holiness* of God, as well as the *Man* Christ Jesus, if he is no more than a Messenger, and not a Saviour ?

As to your Concern for me and other Divines of my Scheme, as you phrase it, “ that “ we should employ all our Zeal and Study to “ represent Almighty God in an unscriptural “ Light,” I sincerely wish you may have no more to answer for in throwing a Cloud upon the Doctrine of Atonement, than we have for misrepresenting the Divine Perfections.

You say, “ it would much exceed the Compass of a Letter, to take Notice of many “ Texts I have cited,” and give us Hopes of a Demonstration that they will not support my Scheme.

ONE would think by this, the Matter was to rest here, at least at present, leaving what you have offered, as you say, to our serious Consideration ; but, alas ! there are yet almost 40 Pages behind, which, if I may be so free, might have been as well spared, being much

^a 1 Thess. i. 10.

^b Coll. i. 20.

the same, or as little to the Purpose, as those we have already attended to.

I HAVE carefully examined what you offer from the LXX, and see no Reason to alter my Sentiments as to the Meaning of the Word Propitiation. That they ever use it in a Sense contrary to the Doctrine of Atonement, I find not. And it must be very extraordinary if they did, when they had continually before their Eyes the many bloody Sacrifices which were offered to God on the smoking Altars of the Tabernacle and Temple.

SOLOMON directs the Penitent to look to the Temple or House of Atonement, which strongly prefigured the Mediator, *who was to appear in the End of the World, and put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself.*

DANIEL disclaims his own, and the Righteousness of the People, never mentions their Repentance or Amendment in Plea for Pardon, but flies to the Mercy of God, who forgives, in a Way honourable to his great Name, which is, that of *Just and Holy*, as well as *Merciful and Gracious.*

As to the *New Testament*, supposing the *Word* were used but twice; yea, had we never met with it there, if we have the *Thing*, and that most plainly and frequently revealed, it is sufficient to our Purpose. The Question not being about the Use of a single Term, but the Doctrine of the Bible. When *Peter* says to his Master, God be propitious to thee; or, as our Translators have modestly rendered it, Far be this from thee, I suppose he spoke as a *Jew*, in a Phrase of common Use among the People: And were they, or could they be Strangers to a Sacrifice?

WHAT

WHAT you next quote from the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, is evidently a Promise of the new Covenant, and therefore must be understood in Harmony, with the Character of the *Surety* of that Covenant, who has told us of a ^c *New Testament in his Blood, shed for his People*, for the Remission of their Sins, and of whose Blood alone it is said, ^d *that it cleanseth from all Sin*.

WHAT follows concerning the Mercy and Grace of the Father, is admitted, if you take the whole Text, viz. that ^e *we are blessed with all spiritual Blessings in Christ*, that we are *chosen in him*, and *predestinated unto the Adoption of Children by Jesus Christ*: That in him *the beloved*, we are *accepted and have Redemption through his Blood the Forgiveness of Sins*: I say, take the whole Account, and make what you can of it, the Evidence will be full, that the Father is only propitious to Sinners in his Son the Lord Jesus Christ, our Saviour and Redeemer.

HERE you leave, for the present, the Doctrine of Propitiation, and set yourself to oppose the Divinity of Christ: The Amount of your Reasoning I take to be this, St Paul often calls God the God he worshipped, the *God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, our Lord Jesus prayed to, and offered Thanksgivings to his Father, says to his Disciples, *my God and your God*, calls him the *only true God*, therefore you conclude Christ is not God, nor are we to pray, or offer Praise to him: That the Father is God, you know we admit, and if the Apostle may be credited, *he*

^c Luke xxii. 20.^d 1 John i. 7.^e Eph. i. 2, 3.

who ^f purchased his Church unto himself by his own Blood, was God; that ^g he who concerning the Flesh was of the Father's, was God over all, blessed for ever more; yea, that in this Christ ^h dwells all the Fullness of the Godhead bodily.

AND how exprefs is the Testimony of the Father to the Divinity of the Son, when he says to him, ⁱ thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever; and that of David, ^k the Lord, that is, the Father, said unto my Lord, the Redeemer, sit thou at my Right-hand till I make thine Enemies thy Footstool. And when the Divine Father gave out the Word, ^l and let all the Angels of God (the highest Order of Creatures) worship him, will you charge him with enacting Idolatry by a Law? This you must do, if he is not God, for God only is the Object of Worship.

YOUR three next Pages contain little more than a confused Repetition of what you have more than once mentioned already, viz. that the Love or Grace of God is the Spring of every Blessing, and that Christ himself is the Gift of God. You single out Adoption, which the Apostle ascribes to the good Pleasure of the Father's own Will, and to the Praise of his Grace: True, but remember all this is in Christ, in whom we have Redemption, &c.

WHO says God took a Creature as "a Partner in his Purposes to advise and counsel him?" But does it hence follow, that the Son of his Bosom is not Privy to his Designs? If all the Fullness of the Godhead is in Christ, then, as he

^f Acts xx. 28.

^g Rom. ix. 5.

^h Col. ii. 9.

ⁱ Heb. i. 8.

^k Psalm cx. 1.

^l Heb. i. 6.

tells us in very strong Terms, ^m *as the Father knoweth him, even so knoweth he the Father*, which I see not how he could with Truth, not to say Modesty, affirm, if any, even the deep Things of God were hid from him.

I AM not surpris'd that you reject Christ as an Interposer, or Intercessor, when you have fixed his Character to be merely a Publisher of Mercy, and an Example of Patience.

IF we want no Propitiation, then Redeemer, Saviour, and Advocate, are Terms of little Importance, and may easily be dispensed with.

IN Page 39, and here again in Page 50, you are angry with the Expression of "God out of Christ a consuming Fire.

I SUPPOSE it must be my Addition of "a God "out of Christ" that displeases you, for otherways we have the Phrase three Times in Scripture, twice by *Moses*, and once by the Apostle, neither of whom had the least Doubt of God's Mercy or Goodness.

You must admit, that the finally ungodly and impenitent will be punished with everlasting Destruction. These will be found on the Left-hand of Christ, bearing no Relation to him, but that of the Creatures of his Power; and as the Fire of God's Wrath will break out upon them, the Expression is to be justified, that a God out of Christ is a consuming Fire.

IN Answer to my Observation, that the "Necessity of an Atonement may be evinced from the "Sanction of the Law." You add, "Cannot

^m John x. 15.

ⁿ Deut. iv. 24. and ix. 3. Heb. xii. 29.

“ God then shew Mercy and Love to Penitents?
 “ Is it not a Part of his Law, or his Rule in the
 “ Government of Mankind, to intreat, to exhort,
 “ to beseech, to promise Favour upon Amendment?”

I ANSWER, will he do this out of Christ? Where has he said so? Read the Gospel, and produce your Vouchers; our Inquiry is not about what God *can* do, but what he has revealed as his *Will* respecting the Salvation of Sinners, and this is expressly confined to Jesus Christ.

You seem to have no Notion of God's Law, but that of a Rule, and overlook it as a Covenant with an awful Denunciation against the Breakers of it, saying, ° *Cursed is every one who continueth not in all Things written in the Book of the Law to do them.*

WHATEVER you may think of the *Mutability* of God's Law, our Lord was of another Mind, when he said, that not ^p *one jot or Tittle of it shall in any wise pass away, till all be fulfilled:* And the Apostle rejects the Charge of making void the Law with the utmost Detestation, God forbid; as if he had said, the Attempt would be impious, and the Event impossible.

As to God's “ *Unfaithfulness in not executing his Promise in punishing,*” I suppose you mean *Threatning*; you know upon our Principles Sin is punished, and the Sinner spared, the Justice of God is glorified in the Sufferings of the Redeemer, and his Mercy illustrious in the Forgiveness of the Offender. These are no *Extremes*, but the plain Truths of the Gospel.

° Gal. iii. 10.

^p Matth. v. 18.

THAT God did receive full Satisfaction from Christ, is of easy Proof; for the Apostle is express, ^a *that he was delivered for our Offences, and rose again for our Justification.* That it is ^r *God that justifieth*, the Foundation of which is, *it was Christ who died, yea, rather that is risen again:* And of this our glorious High-Priest we are told, that ^t *he was once offered to bare the Sins of many, and appeared once in the End of the World to put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself.*

So that it is not our Doctrine, or that of the Church of Rome only, but a Revelation from God: Nor are we ashamed to acknowledge Christ in the Character of a Surety or Bondsman, but thankfully remember, that ^t *as the Lord laid on him the Iniquity of us all, he was wounded for our Transgressions, bruised for our Iniquities, and the Chastisement of our Peace was upon him, by whose Stripes we are healed.*

PAGE 52, you propose to animadvert on *some Texts* I have cited, with an Inaccuracy beneath my Character.

THESE I suppose you select from the *many*, you say Page 44, you have not Room to take Notice of; and you begin with that of the Apostle, ^u *without shedding of Blood is no Remission.*

You say the Proposition is not universal, I say, and every one must see it is. The former Expression I agree is limited, but this is not; and as to the Forgiveness of Sin before the ceremonial Law, we know there were Sacrifices of slain

^a Rom. iv. 25.
26, 28.

^r Rom. viii. 33, 34.
^t Isaiah liii. 5, 6.

^c Heb. ix.
^u Heb. ix. 22.

Beasts as early as *Abel*, and believe they were typical of that Propitiation which the Apostle speaks of, when he says, *God set forth his Son to be a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood, to declare his Righteousness, for the Remission of Sins which are past*; that is, as we understand it, all the Sins of God's People from *Adam* to *Christ*.

AND with how much Evidence you say this Passage of Scripture is against us, let any Man Judge. The Account you give is, "That all have
" sinned, but are justified freely by his, that is,
" God's Grace and Favour——by the Redemp-
" tion and Deliverance, that is, by *Christ*, whom
" God appointed to be the Person, who should
" declare his Mercy——As God appointed the
" Mercy-seat to be the Place where he would
" declare his Mercy for a Demonstration of God's
" Righteousness by his Remission of past Of-
" fences——By the Forbearance of God, who
" demonstrated his righteous Dealing, by de-
" claring him a just Person who held the Faith
" of *Christ*, or was a Christian." A more jejune and inaccurate Exposition I have hardly met with.

IN the 19th Verse the Apostle tells us, the *Law stops every Mouth*, because, as he adds, Verse 22, *All have sinned, and come short of the Glory of God*, and then gives us an Account of *Justification*, not for our Works, but freely of God's Grace, the glorious Original of all new Covenant Blessings; not for our Repentance or Amendment, but through the Redemption that is in *Jesus*, which he elsewhere calls * *Redemption through his*

* Eph. i. 7.

Blood ; and adds, for the Encouragement of Souls burdened with Sin, that God hath *set forth this Jesus to be a Propitiation*. Understand it of the Decree or Promulgation, he is still the Propitiation, and not as you suggest, the Person to publish it only, or who was merely to declare his Mercy.—In which the Apostle is expressly against you, it was to declare, he says, his Righteousness, that he might be just, that is, appear in the Glory of his Justice, in forgiving Sins which were past, and justifying him which believeth in Jesus.

As to the Mercy-seat of old, you will remember it was sprinkled with Blood, and the High-Priest himself had no Access to it, but as carrying Blood along with him.

AND now let the Reader judge which Interpretation comes nearest to the Argument of the Apostle, the Sense of the Words, and the End of God in the Dispensation, which is to exclude all Boasting, or that he who glories, should glory in the Lord.

WE admit ^y Death is the Wages of Sin, and that the free Gift of God is eternal Life ; but you should have added as the Holy Ghost has done, through Jesus Christ our Lord ; or, as it is elsewhere expressed, as Sin hath reigned unto Death, even so Grace reigns through Righteousness unto eternal Life by Jesus Christ the Lord.

HERE again you take Leave of the Argument, and return to your Quarrel with the Deity of the blessed Jesus.

You ask, "Did God send his *Son*, that *Son* I believe to be of the same *Essence* with the Father?" And with some Warmth repeat it, "Did God send such a Son on a Message?" Why, truly, Sir, I think he did; that is, the Father, the first Divine Person, sent the Son, the second Divine Person, to save his People; nor is this, in the least, inconsistent with the Unity of *Nature* or *Essence*, which you know we as strongly assert as you can.

THAT he who was sent is God, the great God, and God over all, God manifest in the Flesh, is the Doctrine of the Apostle: That Christ and his Father are *one*, is his own Language, nor was it any Robbery to the Divine Father, in the Judgment of the Apostle, that Christ should represent himself as equal with him.

As to the Pope and his Missionaries, Truth is Truth, let it come through the Hands of the worst of Men; but pray, Sir, what is this to the Argument? Would you reject the Testimony of *foul Spirits*, when they say, *Jesus* we know, and *Paul* we know, and elsewhere of the Apostles, ² *these are the Servants of the most high God*? Children may be frightened with these Things, but a very slender Judgment, with a little Observation, must discover their Weakness.

YOUR Interpretation of *Heb. i. 9*, is, I think, as little to the Purpose.

Is it not the manifest Design of the Apostle to represent Christ as more excellent than the Angels? And let any one read the Account with

² Acts xvi. 17.

Attention, what can more fully express his Glory as the great Creator, and unchangeable Lord of all?

WE say not, he is the Person of the Father, but we say, as his Father says, *he is God*, that is, of the same Nature and Essence with him.

As to *Coloss. i. 19*, the same Apostle tells us, that in him dwelleth all the Fulness of the Godhead, which I think to assert of a Creature, would be more than an Approach to Blasphemy.

As to *John i. 1*, the Apostle does not say the Divine Word was the same Person with the Father, but was *with him* as a Person distinct from him; and was God, that is, of the same Nature and Glory with him.

THAT the Words God over all, *Rom. ix. 5*, are a Doxology to God the Father, is *said*, not proved, nor will the Design of the Apostle, in his Representation of Christ, admit it, as every Reader must see on consulting the Place; and I must say, it is a poor Shift to evade the Force of so plain and noble a Testimony, to object that in another Place of Scripture, something similar to this is said of the Father.

I THINK it no Disparagement to agree with the *Few* and *Weak*, as you call them, among the Ancients, who apply this Scripture to Christ, at the same Time I must put it to your Conscience, whether this is not a Slander, as you cannot but know that it was the received Opinion of the first and purest Ages of Christianity?

As to Christ's acknowledging the Father to be the only true God, we cheerfully subscribe to it, when opposed to *Idols*, or false Gods, but is this inconsistent

inconsistent with the Divinity of the Son? No more than when we read that Christ is the Mighty God, we are to confine the Character to him, and exclude the Person of the Father from Deity or Omnipotence.

As to the Notice Christ is taking of our Zeal for his Glory, if we are not deficient in it, we are in no Danger of Redundancy; for as I have before told you, we cannot carry his Character too high, whilst with equal Ardor we assert and endeavour to maintain the Glories of the Divine Father and Holy Spirit as the one God, the Object of religious Worship, and Fountain of all good.

You seem to be much concerned, that we are entangled with *Modern Notions*, and *Metaphysical Terms*.

Good, Sir, if we are *Novatores* then in Doctrine, we have a little Antiquity for our Language? But pray what are the Metaphysical Terms, they must be *Essence* and *Person*, not Three or Divine? Surely a Man may form an Idea of these, without being an Adept in that mysterious Branch of Science.

I THANK you for placing me with many Thousands of "*Writers and Preachers of the later Ages, and of the present Age.*" These, with a few of the weak and ignorant of the Ancients, may bare a Man out a little, that he is not alone or singular in his Opinion.

BUT I find our Propositions will be of no Weight with you, except we can deliver them in the very Words of Scripture.

I THOUGHT

I THOUGHT our Inquiries should be about the Sense of Revelation, which in many Instances cannot be fully collected from a single Text, but by comparing several together, is easy and obvious.

IN the Case before us, I apprehend the Bible is not so destitute of Terms as you imagine. More than a few of the Ancients thought the Commission for baptizing, explicitly declares the Doctrine of the Trinity, and we *Moderns* think the Apostolic Benediction full to the same Purpose. We think a God manifested in the Flesh, and the Sin against the Holy Ghost as distinguished from the Father and Son, are very expressive of Divine Glory with distinct Personality.

As to humane Creeds, I am surprized to hear you call for a Testimony from them, when your Friends have treated them with so much Contempt. I believe you will be hard put to it, to find any ancient or many of our modern Creeds, bad as they are, representing Christ as a mere Minister to publish the Mercy of God, and not a Redeemer.

You add, it is no new Controversy, how then are we the *Novatores*? Pray recollect yourself. Have there been only a few weak Christians among the *Latins* and *Greeks*, Papists and Protestants, who have contended for the Doctrine of the Trinity? Surely the Controversy could never be canvassed for so many Ages, without Numbers on each Side.

As to my Caution in speaking of God's Essence, I suppose no honest Man can declare his Sentiments to be *agreeable to Scripture*, without believing

believing they are contained in it, if not in express Words, yet always in Sense. An Appeal to Revelation is ridiculous, but upon this Principle.

YOUR Question is needless when you ask, Did Christ or his Apostles ever speak of God, or the three Persons in our Language? We have proved they did, or what amounts to it, and all your Skill in Criticism will not help you to remove the Evidence from the 'fore-mentioned Commission to baptize in the Name of the adorable Three, nor from the Apostolic Benediction, in which distinct Addresses are made to these incomprehensible Persons.

WHAT follows, Page 58, is little better than a vain Boast about what no-body every denied, that you can produce ten, a hundred, or a thousand Passages of Scripture, in which God is represented as *One*, indeed you seem to express *one Person*, in Contradistinction to the Son and Spirit, but none of the Texts you produce are of this Kind.

THE two former of your Texts have been considered already; as to the latter, *To us there is but one God*; if you look into the Chapter, you must see that the Opposition lies between the Idols mentioned *ver. 4*, and the true God, and not between the first and second Persons in the Trinity. And it would be very unaccountable, if the Apostle designed to exclude the Son, he should in the next Words add, and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all Things, and we by him.

E

THIS

THIS is certain, the Apostle is express in asserting Christ to be God, no Account therefore of the Unity of the Deity is to be received in Contradiction to it.

UPON this you return again to the Death of Christ, and give us some *Data* or *Preliminaries* to settle the Meaning of the Texts which relate to it.

THE two first are general Observations, and may readily be granted; but your third will hardly pass; being a shameful begging the Question.

You say "Propositions in the holy Scripture, that are plain, evident, and agreed on, and never yet controverted among any Christians in any Age since Christ's Time, should not be now called in Question, but admitted as Maxims in the Christian Religion;" and then more than insinuate, that the Godhead is confined to the Person of the Father, and would have us believe, that this is one of those plain incontestable Principles which we are to set down as Christian Maxims.

It would be easy here to point out the dangerous Consequences of an implicit Faith, and the Difficulty of finding a proper Person, on whose Judgment and Integrity we might rely for Information, that none of those plain Truths, as you call them, have been at any Time disputed. As to the Argument before us, we have your own Word for it, that it is "a no new one, but has been canvassed for many Ages by *Greeks* and *Latins*, Papists and Protestants;" so that

it is quite beside this Rule, our Author himself being Judge.

As to Creeds, let them wear what *Name* soever, they are of no Account with us, any farther than they agree with the Word of God, the only Rule of our Faith and Worship.

WE utterly disclaim Imposition, and are for an open Examination, desiring always to form our Apprehensions of Truth from the sacred Oracles, and we think they are far from being silent as to a Trinity of Persons in the Divine Nature.

YOUR last Preliminary I pass over, as being little more than a disagreeable Repetition of what we have so often before met with.

AND now, Sir, what are these Data, the second excepted, to the Death of Christ, or the Scriptures, by which it is represented to us? I confess I had every whit as much Light before, as since I have read them, and believe the Subject would be as intelligible to every serious Reader, had you spared this Pains, and left us to the Bible.

WHAT follows to Page 64, has nothing new but a Suggestion, that "Christ in his Conversation with his Disciples, never mentioned his Death as necessary to satisfy the Justice of God, to atone for Sin, to ransom, &c."

But, Sir, are you not greatly mistaken? Did not Christ tell them, ^b *that it was expedient for him to go away?* ^c *That as Moses lifted up the Serpent in the Wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up?* And that when he was ^d *lifted up, he would draw all Men unto him?* Did he not say,

^b John xvi. 7.

^c John iii. 14.

^d John xii 32.

the Son of Man must be *betrayed, mocked, crucified*, and the third Day rise again? That he must *“suffer and drink the Cup which his Father gave?”* And in so many Words informs them, that he was to *“lay down his Life for his Sheep, and give his Life a Ransom for many?”* How then was he wholly silent? Could he well be more explicit?

YOUR Reasons for the Stress the Scripture lays upon the Death and Blood of Christ, are such as would tempt one to believe you purposely overlooked that, which I think is evidently the *Chief*, viz. *“That he might save us from Wrath, and obtain for us eternal Salvation.”*

You say the Apostles “judged it necessary to
“magnify the Character of their Master, and
“faithful Martyr, on occasion of the Offence
“which the *Jews and Greeks* took at the Doctrine
“of the Cross, his Death being the highest Testi-
“mony of the Truth of his Doctrine, and of
“his intire Submission to the Will of God.”

AND can you really believe, that the Apostle *Paul*, in the 5th of the *Romans*, from the 6th to the 12th Verse, intended no more than to show Christ was an honest Man, or faithful Martyr? Or, as you add in your second Reason, that he was only the best *Pattern his Disciples could imitate, in suffering for the Cause of God and Truth?*

WE admit we are not to frame or introduce other Ends of Christ's Death and Sufferings, than those which the holy Scriptures have declared, but surely we are not to overlook those which are of the greatest Concern.

^e John x. 11.

^f Matth. xx. 28.

^g Rom. v. 9.

² Tim. ii. 10.

THE Death of Christ holds forth many useful Lessons, and the Doctrine of Remission is not the least of them.

YOUR Interpretation of Christ's *bearing our Sins*, that is, you say, "sinful Usage," is *low* and *evasive*; and, according to this, *Peter* should have said in a parallel Place, he died the Just by the Unjust, and not for the Unjust.

CHRIST we well know died, that we might be holy, and to lead us to God, but did he not also die, that he *might redeem us from the Curse of the Law*? Are we not *reconciled to God by the Blood of the Cross*? Did he *not take away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself*? How partial are your Reasons! How evasive of the grand Design of his Crucifixion!

HAD you given us the whole Account in your sixth Reason, and fairly represented the Apostle's Testimony in *Rom. v.*, it would have stood thus: *That while we were yet Sinners, Christ died for us; that we are justified by his Blood, saved from Wrath through him; reconciled to God by his Death; saved by his Life, and that by him we receive the Atonement.* Let the Reader judge whether this is not more than *bearing Witness* to the Truth, and leaving us an *Example* of suffering with *Resignation*.

THE Remainder of this Reason is a Repetition of what you have said often before. With this Improvement, if it is any, you deny Christ's Death to be a Sacrifice to the Justice of God, and assert it to be a mere Free-will Offering to the Will of God; but as you have offered no Proof, I stay not to reply to it.

IN

IN your seventh Reason you propose the Agony of Christ as a Proof, that he had no Thoughts of satisfying God's Justice, &c.

You have before taken much Pains to degrade Christ from the Glory of a God, and in this you would sink him below the Character of a *Man*; I mean such a *Man* as many of the *Martyrs* were, who went chearfully and singing to Execution.

HAD Christ nothing in View but *Death*, say the most painful and ignominious? Would this have put him into such Distress of Soul? Methinks his Agony is an evident Proof, that he knew the Sword of his Father was now drawn, and that he must bare the Weight of that Wrath which was due to the Sins of his People; or, he discovered a Cowardice unworthy the Captain of Salvation.

THAT Christ is of the same Essence with the Father, and the two Divine Persons, conscious of all the Divine Councils, is, we think, most abundantly revealed in Scripture, whatever may be your Judgment concerning them.

YOUR next ten Pages are of the same Kind with what you have so many Times already offered; and as you produce no new Evidence, but rather grow dull in the disagreeable Repetition, I pass on to your Questions, Page 78, "Do not the
" holy Scriptures expressly affirm the Father to be
" the God of Jesus, &c?"

AND suppose we admit all you have produced, and answer in the *Affirmative*, What does all this prove? We grant Christ was truly a *Man*, a *Mediator* between God and Man, the *Messenger* of
the

the Covenant, the High-Priest and Apostle of our Profession, and that he acted up to these Characters; but does it hence follow, that he is not God? Any one must see the Weakness of this Reasoning.

THAT God is a Spirit, and that the Father is a Divine Person, we grant; but that the Father is God to the Exclusion of the Son, or was worshipped as such by the Apostles, Disciples, and Churches in all Ages, we deny.

ONE would think you a Stranger to the most common Doxologies of the Reformed Churches, to imagine supreme Worship to be confined to the Father; our Prayers generally end indeed with the Mediation of Christ, but our Ascription of Glory, &c. is to Father, Son, and Spirit. This you must know, though you seem to suggest the contrary.

THE last Thing you urge, is, "A Search into
" ancient MS. to justify the Doctrine of the Tri-
" nity, which has been to no Purpose attempted
" by eminent Divines, &c."

IF such Worthies have failed, I wonder not that you cease to expect it from us.

"THE Holy See, you think, may, to serve a
" Purpose, corrupt an old MS. or forge a new
" one, to exhibit a Text in our Terms," though
you say, "the Complutentian Edition of Car-
" dinal Zimenes had more Modesty than to do
" it, as to 1 John v. 7, which you say is allowed
" by all learned Inquirers to be spurious."

You may observe, Sir, I have not once quoted this Passage (so evidently to my Purpose) least you should charge me with the taking Advantage
of

40 *The Deity and Atonement*
of Words, which you deny to be a Part of the
sacred Canon.

BUT I must now freely tell you, I believe they
are a Part of Divine Revelation, and in express
Terms declare the Doctrine we contend for.
You know they are often quoted by the Fathers,
and would certainly have been objected to by
Sabellius or *Arius*, if not by *Praxeas*, had they
mistrusted a Forgery, or so much as suspected
their being genuine, as they so visibly strike at
the Root of their Principles.

BUT for fuller Evidence, I refer you to the
Writings of that most learned Critic, and great
though very aged Divine, the Rev. Mr *Martin*
of *Utrecht*, who was engaged in this Controversy
with your great Champion Mr *Emlyn*, who I
believe had as good a Hand at detecting a Forgery
as any of the most sagacious of our modern
Unitarians.

You have my Thanks for your pathetic Address
in the Close, but must assure you, whilst I heartily
pity your Opposition to the Deity and Atonement
of the Son of God, I see no Reason, from any
thing you have offered, to quit my Regard to
the glorious Redeemer, who with the Father and
Holy Spirit is the Object of my Worship, the
God I serve, and hope to enjoy, to whom be
Glory in the highest; *Amen* and *Amen*.

F I N I S.

the

ney

refs

for.

ers,

by

ney

ted

at

the

reat

rtin

erfy

I

gery

lern

dress

rtily

nent

any

to

nd

the

be